

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,554	04/14/2004	Richard G. Bergman	51630.000078	4417
21967	7590 09/28/2006		EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			QURESHI, AFSAR M	
INTELLECTU	JAL PROPERTY DEPART	MENT	<u></u>	
1900 K STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200			2616	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20006-1109		DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			AV.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/823,554	BERGMAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Afsar M. Qureshi	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communicated Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuth - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ication. tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI I, by statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 14 April 2004					
· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·)⊠ This action is non-final.					
<u> </u>	, —	ters, prosecution as to the me	erits is			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-46</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-46</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th	e correction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-1	152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
 Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa 		received in this National Stag	ge			
* See the attached detailed Office action for	, , , ,	received				
	or a not or the continue copies flot	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO	-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date				
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/21/2004. 	6) Other:	nformal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 38-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-25, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,772. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitation claimed in claim 18 of the above Patent, "wherein the Call Router Server comprises means for providing limited access to a private line using a public line", although not included in the instant Application claim 38.

Application/Control Number: 10/823,554 Page 3

Art Unit: 2616

it is, nonetheless, obvious to one skilled in the art, that the omitted limitation is not critical in making the invention.

- 2. Claim 46 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,772. Claim 46 of the Application is a method claim. However, all the method steps claimed herein are performed in the system claim 26 of Patent No. 6,798,772 and would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the Access Server, Call Router Server and Database Server perform the claimed method steps of Application claim 46.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Afsar M. Qureshi whose telephone number is (571) 272 3178. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (571) 272 7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/823,554 Page 4

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AFSAR QURESHI

9/26/2006